

Oxford Democrat.

VOLUME 5.

PARIS, MAINE, TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 1838.

NUMBER 43.

OXFORD DEMOCRAT,
IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY BY
G. W. MILLETT.
TERMS—One dollar and fifty cents in advance.
One dollar & seventy-five cents at the end of six months.
Two dollars at the end of the year.
No paper discontinued till all dues are paid, but at the option of the Publisher.
ADVERTISEMENTS inserted on the usual terms, the proprietor not being accountable for any error in any advertisement beyond the amount charged for it.
Communications, and Letters on business must be addressed to the publisher, Post-paid.

SPEECH OF
MR. WILLIAMS, OF MAINE,
ON THE BILL TO PROVIDE FOR RUNNING AND
MARKING THE NORTHEASTERN BOUNDARY
LINE, DELIVERED IN THE SENATE OF
THE UNITED STATES, MAY 14,
1838.

In Senate, May 14 1838.—On asking leave to bring in a bill to provide for running and marking the Northeastern Boundary line, according to the treaty of 1783.

On a former day, I gave notice that on this day I would ask leave to introduce a bill to provide for running and making the Northeastern Boundary line, according to the treaty of 1783, and pursuant to that notice, I propose now to ask that leave. The object of the bill is to make it the duty of the President to cause that line to be run and marked, as it is described in the Treaty of Peace.

Among the few questions remaining unsettled between this country and foreign nations, there is, probably, not one so irritating, and so likely to disturb our amicable relations, as that of the Northeastern Boundary. It is now more than half a century since our ancestors, by their struggles and sufferings in the war of the Revolution, successfully resisted the tyranny and oppression of the mother country, and obtained for themselves and their posterity the acknowledgment that the then colonies of Great Britain were free, sovereign, and independent States, and a relinquishment, by his Britannic Majesty, of all claims to the Government property, and territorial rights of the same and every part thereof; and yet, at this day, it is a fact that the British Government usurp possession, and claim jurisdiction, over more than one third part of the State of Maine, then part of the province of Massachusetts Bay, the government and territory of which were expressly relinquished. Yes, sir, notwithstanding the territory now in dispute was at the formation of the treaty, part and parcel of the then province of Massachusetts Bay, and so represented and designated upon Mitchell's map, which was used and referred to by the commissioners in making the treaty, it is true that the British Government now claim it as a part of New Brunswick, then Nova Scotia, and deny to this Government the right to occupy it, or to exercise any jurisdiction over it. This claim, by the British Government, is comparatively of recent origin, (having sprung up since the treaty of Ghent,) but is persisted in with great tenacity, and has been, and still is the cause of continued border difficulties between the people and authorities of the State of Maine and of the province of New Brunswick, and those troubles are increasing daily. Already have some of our own citizens been arrested upon our own territory, dragged to a foreign jail, imprisoned, tried, and condemned, under the pretence of offences against the sovereignty and laws of a foreign Government, but in fact for no crime other than obeying or attempting to execute the laws of their own country within our rightful limits. And the Government and people of Maine are warned, by the authorities of New Brunswick, that any attempt to exercise jurisdiction within what they denominate "disputed territory," will be resisted and repelled "if the whole military force of British America should be necessary to effect it." This is a condition of things that cannot, and will not, be submitted to. Soon after Maine was separated from Massachusetts, in 1819, measures were taken for the protection of the timber upon a part of what is now claimed to be disputed territory, surveyed some of the lands into townships, and made preparations for opening roads and settling the country. Some of these acts were complained of by the British Government as inconsistent with the understanding between the Government and Great Britain, "that, pending the negotiations for settling the boundary line, each party should abstain from any acts of sovereignty over the contested territory, and upon the request of the General Government, Maine postponed some of her proposed improvements. At the same time the authorities of New Brunswick were extending their claims to ownership and jurisdiction, which furnished cause of complaint by Maine, the General Government which was communicated by the latter to the British Government, producing at some times a disavowal of the acts, and at other times a claim that the acts were justifiable. In this state of things the attention of the Legislature of Maine was often called to the subject of their boundary, and the history and progress of their title have been embodied in laws and resolutions which were forwarded to Congress, and the aid of the General Government was urgently requested to bring about the settlement and establishment of the line of boundary. More recently, and since the commencement

of the present session of Congress, (very soon after the reception of the last communication from the British Government upon the boundary question,) the President caused to be sent to the Governor of Maine a statement of the correspondence which had been had between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain upon the subject of the boundary, since the rejection of the opinion of the arbitrator in 1832, with a request that he would adopt such measures as he might deem necessary to ascertain the sense of the State of Maine with respect to the expediency of attempting to establish a conventional line, as well as to additional surveys and explorations with a view to the satisfactory adjustment of the controversy according to the terms of the treaty, or enabling the parties to decide more understandingly upon the expediency of opening a negotiation for a line that would suit their mutual convenience, &c. The message of the Governor communicating that statement to the Legislature, and the resolution of the Legislature thereupon, which I had the honor a few days ago to present to the Senate, have been printed, and are in the hands of Senators. They are a full, unequivocal, and direct response to the questions propounded, and speak the language and determination, not of a party, or of a mere majority, but of the whole Legislature & people of Maine. This, sir, is no party question in Maine. The whole people of that State feel that they are injured, and that their appeals to the General Government for the protection and guarantee of their rights, which they believe the Constitution of the U. S. was designed to afford them, have already been too long disregarded; and they now hope and trust Congress will adopt such measures as will insure the running and making of the boundary line between that State and a foreign Government, according to the terms of the treaty. Such measures are not intended by Maine, and ought not to be regarded by others, as hostile, but as means, and probably the only means, of settling the question of boundary for many years yet to come. The bill which I propose to submit and urge the passage of, in conformity with the resolutions of my State, provides that the boundary line to be run and marked agreeably to the provisions of the treaty of peace of 1783. The time for executing this service, and the manner of doing it, is left entirely to the discretion of President, and it is believed that it may be done without giving just cause of offence to Great Britain. What other mode of running this line of boundary can be pursued when it is considered that our Government has repeatedly proposed to the Government to Great Britain mutually to appoint surveyors or commissioners to run and mark the line according to the treaty, and that those propositions have been declined on the pretence that the description of the line in the treaty is imperfect that it is impracticable to run that line so as to conform to the treaty, and that the British Government still refuses to assent to such a survey and running of the line unless this Government will agree to such preliminaries as would change, or render impracticable, the survey of the line of the treaty.

It will be seen by reference to the correspondence between this Government and that of Great Britain, since the rejection of the opinion of the arbitrator, that our Government have been constantly endeavoring to open negotiations with Great Britain for the establishment of the line according to the treaty of 1783; that the British Government have declined to negotiate upon that basis, and have insisted and still insist, that a conventional line must be substituted for the treaty line. That there may be no mistake upon this party of the subject, the correspondence between the two Governments should be examined with care and it will show that on the 21st of July, 1832, Mr. Livingston informed Mr. Bankhead that the decision of the arbitrator had been rejected by the Senate; and that the President, in pursuance of the advice of the Senate, proposed "to open a new negotiation with his Britannic Majesty's Government for the ascertainment of the boundary between the possessions of the United States and those of Great Britain on the northeastern frontier of the United States, according to the treaty of peace, of 1783;" and it was further suggested that if the parties should be unable to agree upon the establishment of the treaty line, means might be found of avoiding the constitutional difficulties that hitherto had attended the establishment of a new boundary more convenient to both parties than that designated by the treaty, and that such a negotiation would naturally embrace the right of navigation of the river St. John. On the 14th of April, 1833, Sir Charles R. Vaughan replied "that his Majesty's Government regret that they cannot discover in this proposition any probable means of arriving at a settlement of this difficult question. It appears to his Majesty's Government to be utterly hopeless to attempt to find out, at this time of day, by means of new negotiation, an assumed line of boundary which successive negotiators, and which commissioners employed on the spot have, during so many years, failed to discover, &c.; that his Majesty's Government will eagerly avail themselves of any probable chance of bringing the question to a satisfactory settlement, and will lose no time in favoring to ascertain from Mr. Livingston

in the first place, what is the principle of the plan of boundary which the American Government appear to contemplate as likely to be more convenient to both parties, &c.; whether any, and what arrangement for avoiding the constitutional difficulties has yet been concluded with the State of Maine, that it was necessary that his Majesty's Government should be informed of the basis upon which it is proposed to negotiate before they can either entertain the proposal, or decide upon instructions to be given; that they must be previously assured that the President will possess the power of carrying into effect his part of any engagement, &c.; and that this Majesty cannot consent to the negotiation respecting the boundary, by mixing up with it a discussion respecting the navigation of the river St. John."

On the 30th of April, 1833, Mr. Livingston proposed to Sir Charles R. Vaughan that the disadvantages of the modes of settlement heretofore adopted might be avoided by appointing a new commission, consisting of an equal number of commissioners, with an umpire selected by some friendly sovereign, to decide on all points on which they disagree; or by a commission entirely composed of skillful men in Europe, to be selected to be attended in survey and view of the country, by agents appointed by the parties. And further suggested that where two natural boundaries are named, and running from one towards the other on the prescribed course will not touch the other, the rule is not to consider the boundary as one impossible to be traced, but to preserve the natural boundary, and to reach it by the nearest direct course. Thus, if after more accurate surveys shall have been made, it should be found that the north course from the head of the St. Croix should not reach the highlands which answer the description of those designated in the treaty of 1783, then a direct line from the head of the St. Croix, whatever may be its direction, to such highlands ought to be adopted, and the line will still be conformable to the treaty; and Mr. Livingston informs Sir Charles R. Vaughan, that the anticipations of an arrangement by which the Government of the United States might be enabled to treat for a more convenient present state of things, they must treat on the basis of the establishment of the boundary presented by the treaty.

On 11th of May, 1833, Sir Charles Vaughan replies that he is convinced that it is hopeless to expect a favorable result from a renewed negotiation upon that basis; that with regard to the proposal of a commission of boundary, it would be with great reluctance that the British Government could consent to have recourse to such a measure; and that he does not sufficiently comprehend the other view which Mr. L. has partially developed, and suggests that in deviating from the direct north line might lead to mountains to the eastward of it, which would trench upon his Majesty's territories of New Brunswick, and invites Mr. L. to offer some more prompt and effectual measure for the settlement of the Boundary, than the renewal of a negotiation on an inadmissible basis, or having recourse again to commissions of boundary, &c.

On the 28th of May, 1833, Mr. Livingston informs Sir Charles R. Vaughan that the American Government makes no pretensions further east than a line directly north from the source of the river St. Croix; but if, on a more accurate survey, it should be found that the north line mentioned in the treaty should pass each of the highlands therein described, and that they should be found at some point further west, then the principle would apply, viz: that the direct boundaries must be altered, so as to suit their ascertained position; and to simplify the operation, the President is willing that the commissioners should be restricted to the single question of determining the point designated by the treaty as the highlands which divide the waters, to which point a straight line shall be drawn from the monument, &c.

On the 31st of May, 1833, Sir Charles R. Vaughan replies that in appears to him that the question of boundary can only be set at rest by an abandonment of the defective description of boundary contained in the treaty, and the two Governments mutually agreeing upon a conventional line more convenient to both parties; and that the proposition of Mr. Livingston so restricted to the terms of the treaty, that the basis of it is the same as that which he has been instructed by his Government to inform the Government of the United States that it was hopeless to negotiate upon. While the point of departure of the line to be traced according to the proposition of Mr. Livingston is clearly established, the point at which it is to terminate is left in doubt, and to be decided by the special commission, etc. He wishes to be informed what limitations it is intended to put upon the course to be followed by the commission; whether directed to any particular spot, or whether they are to be left at liberty to stop at the first highlands answering the required description, and observes that the impression left upon his mind, after a conversation with Mr. Livingston, and the production of a map upon a small scale is that the highlands to be sought in the man-

ner he proposed, would probably be found north of the St. Johns, but westward some miles of the river St. Francis, and that he would be happy to receive from Mr. McLane some further explanation of the intended course to be pointed out to the special commissioners.

On the 5th June, 1833, Mr. McLane replies that it is not expected that any limitations will be put upon the course to be pursued by the special commissioners, but such as are required by a faithful adherence to the description of the boundary in the treaty of 1783, and proposes to make another effort to overcome the difficulty, and discarding the due north line, should that become necessary; to seek for and divide those rivers that empty themselves into the river St. Lawrence, from those which fall into the Atlantic Ocean; and when these shall be found in any part of the disputed territory, north or south of the St. Johns river, to draw a line from the monument to the said highlands, and to that point thereof which shall be nearest to a due north line from the monument.

On the 10th February, 1834, Sir Charles R. Vaughan replies, that no satisfactory or useful result could be obtained from the local survey proposed by the American Government, until the two parties are agreed upon certain points urged by him, and says no doubt can exist that by going far enough to the westward, such highlands as those required by the treaty could be found, because it is well known that the high ground in the neighborhood of the source of the St. Johns divide the Kennebec, which falls into the Atlantic Ocean, from the Chaudiere, which falls into the St. Lawrence; and upon a full view of the matter, his Majesty's Government think that, in the first place, and previously to any further negotiation, they are entitled to claim from the Government of the United States an acquiescence in the decisions pronounced by the arbitrator upon all those points which he has decided; and in the next place, that as a preliminary to any attempt to settle the remaining point by negotiation, they ought to be satisfied that the Government with which they have to treat is possessed of the powers necessary for carrying into effect any arrangement upon which the two parties might agree.

On the 11th March, 1834, Mr. McLane replies, that the arbitrator having failed to decide the question submitted to him, the opinions of that arbitrator, in the course of his reasoning upon the point submitted, are liable to many objections, which are regarded as insuperable, and repeats the proposition to submit the whole subject to the commission, with an unlimited discretion over all the points necessary to the proper completion of the subject committed to it.

March 16, 1834, Sir Charles R. Vaughan replies, that under such a commission, not a step could be taken, unless the two Governments agree upon two of the subordinate points, viz: the character of the land they are to discover as dividing waters according to the treaty of 1783, and what are to be considered as Atlantic rivers.

March 21, 1834, Mr. McLane replies that the United States have no power to discard the line called for by the treaty of 1783, without the assent of Maine; and that assent, in the present state of the controversy, while there remains a reasonable hope of discovering the true and original boundary, it is not possible to obtain; and under such circumstances, the Government of his Britannic Majesty is invited to unite with the President in another effort, aided by the adoption of a plain and easy rule of surveying, to find the line of the treaty of 1783.

December 8, 1834, Sir Charles R. Vaughan repeats the arguments before urged as to the necessity of agreeing upon the character of the highlands and the river question, and trusts that the American Government will be prepared to agree with that of his Majesty as to the construction to be put upon the passage of the treaty respecting the rivers which empty into the Atlantic Ocean, and will concur in deciding that the Atlantic rivers which are to guide the commissioners in searching for the highlands described in the treaty, are those rivers which fall into the sea to the westward of the mouth of the river St. Croix; and he is instructed to represent to Mr. Forsyth that his Majesty's Government consider a clear agreement between the two Governments on this point to be an indispensable preliminary to the establishment of any new commission of survey. Till this point is decided, no survey of commissioners can lead to any useful result. But the decision of this point turns upon the interpretation of the words of the treaty, and not upon the operation of surveyors; and his Majesty's Government having submitted this point, in common with others, to the judgment of an impartial arbitrator, whose award they have declared themselves ready to abide, they cannot consent to refer it to any other arbitration.

April 28, 1835, Mr. Forsyth replies that it is with unfeigned regret the President learns the decision of his Majesty's Government not to agree to the proposition made in that spirit of accommodation by which United States have throughout been influenced, without a previous compliance on their part with the conditions; that the President is apprised of the decision of Mr. Forsyth.

Mr. Vaughan that he cannot agree to clog the submission with the condition proposed by his Majesty's Government, and that a new submission, if made, should be made without restriction or qualification upon the discretion of the commissioners, other than such as result from established facts, and the just interpretation of the treaty of 1783, and such as heretofore have been, and are now again, tendered by him to his Britannic Majesty's Government.

December 28, 1835, Mr. Bankhead, under instructions from his Majesty's Government, argues the river question, and says that with respect to the President's proposal for a commission of exploration and survey, his Majesty's Government could only agree to such a commission, provided there were a previous understanding between the two Governments that, although neither should be required to give up its own interpretation of the river question, yet as the commission of survey would be intended for the purposes of conciliation, and with a view of putting an end to discussion on controverted points, the commissioners should be instructed to search for highlands, upon the character of which no doubt could exist on either side; repeats that his Majesty's Government are ready to treat for a conventional line, and proposes to divide the disputed territory equally between Great Britain and United States.

February 26, 1836, Mr. Forsyth replies, that agreement between the two Governments is impossible, while his Majesty's Government continues to maintain the position indicated by Mr. Bankhead's note; declines the proposition of his Majesty's Government to divide the disputed territory equally between the two Governments, and says that the President will, if his Majesty's Government consents to it, apply to the State of Maine for its assent to make the river St. Johns, from its source to its mouth, the boundary between Maine and his Majesty's dominions in that part of North America.

March 4, 1836, Mr. Bankhead refers to his note of 28th December, proposing to instruct commissioners to search for highlands, upon the character of which no doubt could exist on either side, and thinks that the Secretary of State has not given this modification on the part of his Britannic Majesty's Government of the President's proposition the full weight to which it was entitled, and again submits it, bearing in mind that the commissioners who may be appointed are not to decide upon points of difference, but are merely to present to the respective Governments the result of their labors, which it is hoped may pave the way for an ultimate settlement of the question; and he notifies Mr. Forsyth that the proposition offered in Mr. Forsyth's note, to make the river St. Johns, from its source to its mouth, the boundary between the United States and his Majesty's Province of New Brunswick, is one to which the British Government, he is convinced, will never agree.

March 5, 1836, Mr. Forsyth hopes that the President's proposition for making the St. John's the boundary, may, when brought before his Majesty's Cabinet, be received in a more favorable light than that in which it appears to have presented itself to Mr. Bankhead.

If, however, the river boundary be rejected before the President consents to the modification of his previous proposition for the appointment of a commission of exploration and survey, it will be necessary to be informed more fully of the views of the British Government in offering the modification, &c.

August 10, 1837, Mr. Stevenson makes known to Lord Palmerston the earnest and unabated desire which the President feels that the controversy should be speedily and amicably settled, and expresses the anxiety with which the Government of the United States is waiting the promised decision of his Majesty's Government upon the proposition submitted to it as far back as July, 1836.

January 10, 1838, Mr. Fox recapitulates the various attempts which have been made to settle the question of boundary and failed; and in reference to the only remaining proposition of a commission of exploration and survey, says, that her Majesty's Government have little expectation that such a commission could lead to any useful result, and on that account would be disposed to object to the measure. But at the same time they are so unwilling to reject the only plan now left which seems to afford a chance of making any further advance in this long pending matter, that they will not withhold their consent to such a commission, if the principle upon which it is to be formed, and the manner in which it is to proceed, can be satisfactorily settled; and says that her Majesty's Government have stated their opinion that, in order to avoid all fruitless disputes as to the character of such highlands, the commissioners should be instructed to look for highlands which both parties might acknowledge as fulfilling the conditions of the treaty. But if the two Governments should agree to the appointment of such a commission, it would be necessary that their agreement should be first recorded in a public convention; and it would obviously be inadvisable that the State of Maine should be an assenting party to the arrangement.

February 6, 1838, Mr. Forsyth.

in the possession of the State of Maine the Jews of her Majesty's Government, as exhibited in Mr. Fox's note, and of ascertaining the sense of the State authorities upon the expediency of meeting those views, has directed him to transmit a copy of it to Governor Kent for their consideration; and, if agreed to, will doubtless be successful, by the adoption of the highlands reported by the commissioners of survey, and would thus secure the treaty line. The British modification looks to no such object. It merely contemplates a commission of boundary analogous to that under the fifth article of the treaty of Ghent, and would, in all probability, prove equally unsatisfactory in practice.

From this history of the efforts on the part of our Government to settle the line of boundary by negotiation, it must be apparent to every Senator that there is no hope of establishing the boundary of the treaty by negotiation. The Government of Great Britain has not, at any time since the rejection of the advice of the arbitrator, consented to treat upon the basis of the treaty line, unless the American Government would, in advance, yield some point that would prove fatal to its just rights under the treaty; and although the British Government have professed to be eager to substitute a conventional line—one that shall be more convenient to both parties than the treaty line—they have never been willing to intimate what line should be, or what equivalents on either side should be granted, except that, after fixing their own limits to what they denominated *disputed territory*, they would consent to divide that territory equally between the two Governments. It is evident and clear, that while our Government have been pressing upon the Government of Great Britain their anxious desire to settle the question of boundary according to the provisions of the treaty, and in some instances have been induced to go beyond what may fairly be regarded the legitimate construction of the treaty, in order to obtain an amicable adjustment of the controversy, it has been the purpose and endeavor of the other party to avail themselves of this disposition to obtain concessions and admissions on our part which, in their effect, would render the description of the boundary contained in the treaty utterly nugatory. After such a lapse of time, and after efforts as have been made on the part of our Government to settle this question of boundary, and with such dispositions on the other part as are manifested by the attempts at negotiation which have been detailed, it is vain to hope that the question of boundary can be settled without some decided action on the part of Congress. What that action shall be depends very much upon the justice of our claim, and upon the pretences of the Government of Great Britain to resist it; and that Senators may be possessed of the means of coming to right conclusions, and of forming a correct judgment upon these points, it is proposed to state, in a brief manner, some of the grounds and evidence upon which it is believed that the right is clearly with us, and that the pretences of the British Government are of recent origin, and without any valid foundation.

By the first article of the treaty of peace of 1763, his Britannic Majesty acknowledges the said United States—viz: New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, etc.—to be free, sovereign, and independent States; that he treats with them as such, and for himself, his heirs, and successors, relinquishes all claims to the Government *property and territorial rights of the same, and every part thereof*. It is admitted, as well on the part of the British Government as of the United States, that the map which was used by the commissioners who negotiated the treaty of peace, and to which they had reference in forming the terms of treaty, was Mitchell's map, of which copies, upon a reduced scale, are now exhibited to the Senate. Upon this map are represented New England, Province of Maine, Province of Sagadahock, on the west side of the river St. Croix, and Nova Scotia or Acadia on the east side of the river, with a line drawn from the source of the St. Croix, directly north to the river St. Lawrence crossing the St. Johns. It is to be remembered that Mitchell's map was published in 1755, when the Province of Massachusetts Bay, as well as the Province of Nova Scotia extended to, and were bounded by the river St. Lawrence, and so continued to be bounded, until the formation of the Province of Quebec in 1763. By the grant of King James the first to Sir William Alexander, afterwards Lord Sterling, in 1621, the boundaries of the Territory of Nova Scotia are, so far as relates to this question, thus described: "to the river commonly called by the name of Holy Cross, or the St. Croix, and to the furtherest source or spring upon the western branch of the same, which first mingles its waters with those of the said river; thence by an imaginary direct line, to be drawn or run through the country, or over the land to the north to the first bay, river, or spring emptying itself into the great river of Canada, and from thence running to the east along the shores of the said river of Canada to the river, bay, or harbor, commonly known, or called by the name of Gachepe, or Gaspee, etc."

By the charter of 2d William and Mary, 1691, it is declared "that the territories and colonies, called and known by the names of the colony of Massachusetts bay and colony of New Plymouth, the Province of Maine and the territory called Acadia or Nova Scotia, and all the tract of land lying between the said territories of Nova Scotia, and the said province of Maine, be erected, united, and incorporated into one province, by the name of our province of the Massachusetts bay in New England."

Upon referring to Mitchell's map, it is seen that the line drawn upon it, from the source of the St. Croix to the river of Canada or St. Lawrence, is the westerly line described in the grant to Sir William Alexander, and Nova Scotia, as then known and understood; and the easterly line of the province of Massachusetts Bay: each of those provinces, when that map was made, extending northwardly to the river St. Lawrence.

After the publication of Mitchell's map, viz: in 1763, by an order in council, the province of Quebec was formed, and the southwardly line of it thus described: "the said line crossing the St. Lawrence and Lake Champlain in forty-five degrees of north latitude, passes along the highlands which divide the rivers which empty themselves into the said St. Lawrence, from those which fall into the sea, and also along the coast of the Bay des Chaleurs and the coast of the Gulf of St. Lawrence to Cape Rosiers," etc. and the like description of boundary is contained in the commissions of Governor Murray November 21, 1763, and to Governor Carlton, April 21, 1767. By the act of Parliament, 14, George III, 1774, making more effectual provision for the government of the province of Quebec, it is enacted that all the territories, islands, and counties in North America, belonging to the Crown of Great Britain bounded on the south, by a line from the Bay of Chaleurs, along the highlands which divide the waters that empty themselves into the river St. Lawrence, from those which fall into the sea to a point in forty-five degrees of north latitude, on the eastern bank of the river Connecticut, etc. be, and they are hereby annexed to, and made part and parcel of, the province of Quebec, as created and established by royal proclamation of the 7th October, 1763. In the commission to Guy Carlton, Governor of Quebec, dated December 27, 1774, the southern boundary of the province of Quebec is thus described: "bounded on the south by a line from the Bay of Chaleurs, along the highlands which divide the rivers that empty themselves into the river St. Lawrence from those which fall into the sea, to a point in forty-five degrees north latitude, etc. After the proclamation of October 7, 1763, the commissions to the several Governors of Nova Scotia, viz: to Montague Wilnot in 1764, to Lord William Campbell in 1765, to Francis Legge, esq. in 1773, and to John Parr, esq. in 1782, described that province of Nova Scotia thus: "to the northward by the southern boundary of our province of Quebec, as far as the western extremity of the Bay des Chaleurs; to the eastward by the said bay and the Gulf of St. Lawrence, to the Cape or Promontory, called Cape Breton, in the island of that name, including said is, etc.; to the westward, (although our said province hath anciently extended, and doth of right extend, as far as the river Pontagnon or Penobscot,) it shall be bounded by a line drawn from Cape Sable, across the entrance of the bay of Fundy to the mouth of the river St. Croix, by the said river to its source, and by a line drawn due north, thence to the southern boundary of our province of Quebec."

The province of New Brunswick was established in 1784, and embraces what was, before that time, the northerly part of Nova Scotia. It is thus described in the several commissions to Governors of the province of New Brunswick, from the first one to Thomas Carlton, in 1784, down to that of the westward by the mouth of the river St. Croix, by the said river to its source, and by a line drawn due north from thence to the southern boundary of our province of Quebec, to the northward by the said boundary as far as the western extremity of bay of Chaleurs, to the eastward by the said bay, and the Gulf of St. Lawrence; to the bay called Bay Verte, to the south," &c. From all these documents, it is clear and undeniable that the western line of what was formerly Nova Scotia, now New Brunswick is, and always has been, the river St. Croix, and a line from the source of that river due north, extending formerly to the river St. Lawrence, and since 1763 to the south line of Quebec, or, to what is the same thing, a line from the bay of Chaleurs, along the highlands, which divide the rivers that empty themselves into the river St. Lawrence from those which fall into the sea toward a point in 45 degrees of northern latitude, &c. That the north line of that province is as far north as we claim the north line of Maine to be, is proved, first, by the fact that the Bay Chaleurs is a part of that north line; secondly, by acts to the provincial Government incorporating counties, and parishes, upon the Bay Chaleurs, and upon the river Restigouche, and regulating the fisheries in that river, granting land, and establishing roads, &c.; thirdly, from the acts, and declaration, of the Surveyors General of the provinces of Quebec and of New Brunswick, in 1787, when it was proposed by the authorities of the province of Quebec to run and mark the line between these provinces, as disclosed in the extracts hereafter mentioned.

Inasmuch as the province of Maine or Massachusetts bay formerly extended to and was bounded north by the river St. Lawrence, and as no change of its boundary had been made prior to the treaty of 1763, (except so far as the province of Quebec had been extended South of the St. Lawrence,) it is only necessary to see how far the south line of Quebec extends to the southward of the province of Massachusetts Bay, as it was at the time of the treaty when his Britannic Majesty relinquished all claim to the government, property and territorial rights of the same and every part thereof. That line was described, in the proclamation, to be a line "crossing the St. Lawrence and Lake Champlain in 45 degrees north latitude, passing along the highlands which divide the rivers which empty themselves into the said river St. Lawrence from those which fall into the sea to

a point in 45 degrees of north latitude, on the eastern bank of the river Connecticut." If there was any doubt as to what highlands were intended by these several descriptions, or as to their locality, in the absence of other satisfactory evidence, it might be sufficient to look upon the map of the country, then extant, and see that a range of highlands, extending all along from the western extremity of the bay of Chaleurs to Connecticut river, in 45 degrees north latitude, and north of all the streams flowing into the St. Johns river, is distinctly represented upon the map, and that no other range of highlands is indicated upon the map, between the bay Chaleurs and Connecticut river; and that this range, as indicated by the map, does divide the streams running northwardly into the sea. But a glance at this map must at once satisfy the mind that such highlands as are mentioned in the proclamation and act of Parliament must, in the nature of things, exist between the great river St. Lawrence on the northwest, and the Atlantic ocean on the southeast, and that such highlands must, of necessity, divide the rivers and streams represented on that map as running in different and opposite directions; and, but for the ingenuity of British agents and diplomatists, it would be difficult to imagine how any question could be made upon such a state of facts.

Thus far the question has been considered of independently of the further article of the treaty of 1763, which was added "that all disputes which might arise in future on the subject of the boundaries of the said United States may be prevented, it is hereby agreed and declared that the following are and shall be their boundaries, viz: From the northwest angle of Nova Scotia, viz: that angle which is formed by a line due north from the source of St. Croix river to the highlands, along the said highlands which divide those rivers that empty themselves into the river St. Lawrence from those which fall into the Atlantic ocean, to the northwestern head of Connecticut river, (and thence round to the Southern boundary,) east by a line to be drawn along the middle of the river St. Croix from its mouth, in the bay of Fundy, to its source, and from its source directly north to the aforesaid highlands which divide the rivers that fall into the Atlantic ocean from those which fall into the river St. Lawrence."

The point of beginning, the terminus a quo, mentioned in this description of the boundary of the United States, viz: the northwest angle of Nova Scotia, not being fixed or marked by any actual monument existing at the time the treaty was formed, it was necessary so to describe it that its position and location might be ascertained and fixed by reference to other known monuments, and directing the manner in which a line should be extended from one to the other, and hence the further description of that angle, the point of departure, viz: "That angle which is formed by a line drawn due north from the source of St. Croix river to the highlands." To determine, therefore, the particular place and location of the angle thus described, it could only be necessary to commence at the source of St. Croix river, and run a line therefrom due north, until it should reach the highlands, and at whatever point of the highlands that line should meet them, would be the angle called for by the treaty. To effect this, the source of St. Croix river and the highlands must be ascertained, and it is matter of history that the two Governments were not, for years after the formation of the treaty, agreed as to what river was the St. Croix river, mentioned in, and intended by, the treaty; the American Government claiming that a river further east than the Scoudiac was the St. Croix of the treaty; and the British Government contending that the Penobscot was the St. Croix of the treaty. This point of disagreement was settled, and finally determined in 1797 by commissioners of both Governments under the provisions of the treaty of 1764, and a monument was accordingly erected at the source of the western branch of the river Scoudiac, or St. Croix river as the source of St. Croix river mentioned in the treaty of 1763, and that monument has ever since been, and now is, recognised by both Governments as the point from which the line is to be drawn due north to the highlands. This point being fixed, and not now disputed, it remains to ascertain what highlands are to be reached by the line running due north from this monument, at which the northwest angle of Nova Scotia is to be located and fixed, and this is that point of difference between this Government and the Government of Great Britain, and of course requires a careful and close examination. In the former part of the description (in the treaty of 1763) of the highlands, at which the angle is to be formed, there is not any further designation of them, than the line drawn due north from the source of St. Croix river to the highlands is the point from which the line of boundary is to start, and that line of boundary is "along the said highlands, which divide those rivers that empty themselves into the St. Lawrence from those which fall into the Atlantic ocean, to the northwestern head of Connecticut river."

It can be shown that the river Scoudiac, as called by the Indians, is the river St. Croix, and that a line along the middle of its source, together with a line due north from its source, formed a part of the western boundary of the province of Nova Scotia, and that the highlands which divide the waters of the said river from the waters of the river St. Lawrence, upon the east coast respectively. The effect, so far as regards the United States, is completely secured by the treaty, in all events, and there is no further reason to suppose it was intended to be interpreted in this respect, if a just interpretation will warrant it. A line due north from the

ence." The highlands mentioned in both parts of the description of boundaries are therefore the same and not different, and, to satisfy the description of them, must be such highlands as divide the rivers in the manner mentioned in the treaty.

That such highlands were known to be near to the river St. Lawrence, and between the source of St. Croix and the river St. Lawrence is not only apparent upon inspection of Mitchell's map, used by the commissioners in forming the treaty of peace, and in preparing the description of boundaries, but was then matter of history and record in England, as well as in the British provinces in North America.

In Pownall's topographical description of part of the British colonies in America, in describing the mountains, highlands, etc. he says: "And in the latitude of 45 or thereabouts, turning eastward, run away to the Gulf of St. Lawrence." Again: "Going from the same line in latitude 45 of the greatest height of this range of mountains, and following them to the east northerly, they all seem to range as united until again divided by the Bay of Chaleurs." Again: "All the rivers which have their sources amidst the northern ridges of this great range fall into Canada or St. Lawrence river, as the St. Francis, Chaudiere, and many others. All which have their sources in the southern ridges, fall into the Bay of Fundy or into the main ocean," etc.

The range of highlands thus described is near to the St. Lawrence and north of the St. Johns, and has always been claimed by the American Government as the highlands intended and described in the treaty; and although formerly admitted to be such by agents of the British Government, it is not so now; but the latter Government contend that the due north line from the source of the St. Croix shall stop at Marr's Hill, which is situated some thirty miles south of the Great Falls in St. Johns river, and not more than forty-five miles from the monument at the source of St. Croix.

To show that the highlands of the treaty were formerly understood and admitted by the agents of the Government of Great Britain to be situated north of the St. Johns river, and where the American Government now claim that they are to be found, the following extracts are submitted:

Extract from minutes of Executive Council of Quebec, Monday, 5th of July, 1787.—Present his Excellency the Governor, &c.

His Excellency intimated the propriety of ascertaining the limits between this and the province of New Brunswick, and that the Surveyor General of that province would soon meet Mr. Holland for that purpose, &c.

Extract from Lord Dorchester's instructions to Mr. John Holland.

Quebec, July 8, 1787.—You will be pleased to accompany Mr. Finlay to the Great Falls, on the St. Johns, in order to assist in marking out the boundary between the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick, &c. You will there meet the Surveyor General of the province of New Brunswick, or some other person authorized by the Lieutenant Governor of that province, in concert with whom and Mr. Finlay, you will proceed upon that business. You will be guided therein by the enclosed description of the boundaries of the provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, extracted from commissions as Governor thereof, in which the line is added, and the description of the boundary of the United States, taken from the definitive treaty for your information, &c.

Extract from Mr. Holland's report.

July 26, 1787.—Pursuant to orders, proceeded to Great Falls, on the river St. Johns, and on the 16th met Capt. Spauld, Surveyor General of New Brunswick, who said that, concerning his waiting for the Great Falls totally unnecessary, he was now proceeding on his way to the height of land or carrying place between St. Lawrence and Lake Timiconta, as there (according to his ideas) the boundary ought to be fixed. I observed, it was generally understood in Canada, that the line between the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick should run from the head of Chaleurs bay along the highlands in a westerly direction to the Great Falls on the St. Johns river, and from thence west to the westernmost or main branch of the river St. Croix. He answered that, should a boundary line be fixed at or near the Great Falls, he would protest against such doing, as contrary to directions laid down in his instructions. I replied, that he would proceed immediately to the point to examine which way the waters inclined in the heights there, that by that course, he might ascertain the boundary between the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick, as all the streams running into the river St. Johns are in the province of New Brunswick, and that the line between the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick is in the province of Quebec. After many arguments to show the impropriety and disadvantage of fixing a boundary on the portage, &c. but more especially that the fixing of that line would materialize the effect of the boundary line, and that the line would be a straight line toward the source of the river Chaudiere which rise on the highlands that commence at the said head of the Bay of Chaleurs, and extend all the way to the northwestern head of Connecticut river."

Extract from the report of the Commissioner of Council of the province of Quebec, appointed to consider the boundary between the provinces of Quebec and New Brunswick, &c. Oct 1st, 1787.

"The Commissioner most humbly submits to your Excellency, that it is not for the advantage of both Governments that the province of Quebec be situated from that of New Brunswick by a line running along the highlands, which extend from the head of Chaleurs bay to the foot of the great fall of St. Johns river, and from thence crossing the river (as also include the whole of the portage or carrying place) and continuing in a straight line toward the source of the river Chaudiere which rise on the highlands that commence at the said head of the Bay of Chaleurs, and extend all the way to the northwestern head of Connecticut river."

Extract from the arguments of the British agent, in 1797, before the Commissioners under the 5th article of the treaty of 1764.

"It can be shown that the river Scoudiac, as called by the Indians, is the river St. Croix, and that a line along the middle of its source, together with a line due north from its source, formed a part of the western boundary of the province of Nova Scotia, and that the highlands which divide the waters of the said river from the waters of the river St. Lawrence, upon the east coast respectively. The effect, so far as regards the United States, is completely secured by the treaty, in all events, and there is no further reason to suppose it was intended to be interpreted in this respect, if a just interpretation will warrant it. A line due north from the

of the western or main branch of the Scoudiac, or St. Croix, will fully secure this effect to the United States in every instance; and also to Great Britain in all instances except in that of the river St. Johns, wherein it is necessary to insert, by way of caution, that the source of the river is to the westward, not only of the western boundary line of Nova Scotia, but of the sources of the Penobscot, and even of the Kennebec, so that this north line must, of necessity, cross the river St. Johns within about 50 miles of Fredericton, the metropolis of New Brunswick but not cutting the sources of the rivers which fall into the bay of Chaleurs, it is not of many others," &c.

Extract from a letter of Robert Liston, his Majesty's Minister Plenipotentiary to the United States, to Lord Chalmers, 18th of July, 1787, agent of the British Government in 1787. "I have the honor, with attention, your letter of this date, and it appears to me evident that the adoption of the river Chaudiere, as a part of the boundary between his Majesty's American dominions and those of the United States, in preference to a line drawn from the northernmost point of the Scoudiac lakes, would be attended with considerable advantage. It would give an addition of territory to New Brunswick, together with a greater extent of navigation on St. Johns river," &c.

It thus appears that when the two Governments were contending with each other as to the true St. Croix, or place which the due north line was to be run, it was well understood and admitted that such due north line would cross the river St. Johns, and that the highlands of the treaty were north of that river. If Marr's Hill (now claimed by the British Government as the highlands of the treaty, and which is far south of the river St. Johns,) had been then supposed or claimed to be the highlands, at which the due north line was to stop, why the zeal and effort of the British agent to fix the starting point (the source of the St. Croix) so far west as that the line, running due north from it, should not cross the St. Johns near Fredericton, but so far up that river as to be beyond where it runs navigable and near to the highlands? Or why should Mr. Liston, the British Minister, write to their agent for managing the question before the commissioners, that, by adopting the course suggested, it would give to New Brunswick a greater extent of navigation on the St. Johns?

Again: at the making of the treaty of Ghent in 1814, it is manifest that the British Government made no pretension that the highlands were south of the St. Johns, or that any portion of the territory now denominated disputed territory belonged to that Government. The idea that the St. Johns river was not an Atlantic river, that the highlands of the treaty were south of the St. Johns, or that the line of boundary was so imperfectly described in the treaty that it was impossible to find and locate it, was not then entertained. Hence we find that, on that occasion, the British commissioners first proposed "such a variation of the line of frontier as may secure a direct communication between Quebec and Halifax." On being informed that the American commissioners had not authority to cede any territory, the British commissioners say that they were not prepared to anticipate the objections stated by the American commissioners that they had no authority to cede territory, however insignificant although the proposal left it open to them to demand an equivalent for such cession, in frontier or otherwise; and further add, that "they are persuaded that an arrangement on this point might be easily made, if entered into with a spirit of conciliation, without any prejudice to the interests of the district in question, [viz: the new State of Maine,] and Col. Bouchette, Surveyor General of Lower Canada, in his Topographical description of the province of Lower Canada, printed in London in 1815, says: "The main ridge, continuing its northerly direction, is intersected by an imaginary line, prolonged in a course astronomically due north from the head of the river St. Croix, and which ridge is supposed to be the boundary line between Lower Canada and the United States; at least such appears to be the way in which the treaty of 1763 is construed by the American Government, but which ought more fairly to be understood as follows, viz: that the astronomical line running north from the St. Croix, should extend only to the first or easterly ridge, and thence run westerly along the west of said ridge to the Connecticut, thereby equitably dividing the waters flowing into the St. Lawrence from those that empty into the Atlantic within the United States and those that have their estuaries within the British province of New Brunswick. It is important, and must always have been had in contemplation, that an uninterrupted communication and connection should exist between all his Majesty's North American possessions; but by the manner in which the treaty is insisted upon by the opposite party, a space of more than eighty-five miles would be placed within the American limits, and by which the British provinces would be completely severed; it would also produce the inconvenience of having the mail from England to Quebec carried over that distance of American territory, which might be deemed either as matter of indulgence, or complained of as an encroachment, according to the temper of the times."

Since it was ascertained that the American Government was not disposed to vary the treaty line, to cede or to exchange for an equivalent, the right of communication between Quebec and Halifax, which seems so desirable to the British Government, other objections have been invented and used by that Government against the claim and right of the American Government to the territory before admitted to be ours, and which most clearly ours by the terms of the treaty of 1763. One of these objections is, that if St. Johns river does not empty its waters to the sea or Atlantic ocean, but into the Bay of Fundy, and hence that the highlands which divide the waters running into the St. Lawrence from those which run into the river St. Johns, are not such highlands as are called for by the treaty. Second: that there are not any highlands north of the St. Johns river which would be reached by running

the line due north from the source of St. Croix, and that a line along the middle of its source, together with a line due north from its source, formed a part of the western boundary of the province of Nova Scotia, and that the highlands which divide the waters of the said river from the waters of the river St. Lawrence, upon the east coast respectively. The effect, so far as regards the United States, is completely secured by the treaty, in all events, and there is no further reason to suppose it was intended to be interpreted in this respect, if a just interpretation will warrant it. A line due north from the

42 STEPHEN EMERY. July 1904
Copy, Amos - Levi Stowell, Jr. -
copying extra -

